REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated September 18, 2008. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 are pending. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 are rejected. No claims have been amended and no claims have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 remain pending in the present application.

The Examiner maintains the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,708,780 (Levergood) in view of the Fileview Functionality Sheet (Fileview).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39. Applicant's invention generally relates to a network environment where a client address apparent to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server. As described in independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 39, in response to receiving a URL request from a client for a file from the first server, the first server determines if a user of the client has been granted authorization to access the file. The first server generates a transfer ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization access. The transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server. In response to receiving the transfer ticket from the client by the second server, the second server redirects the client back to itself with a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server. When the second server receives the URL ticket from the client, it verifies the URI ticket on the second server and returns the file.

In contrast, Levergood discloses a client request made with a URL from a web browser. A content server redirects the client to an authentication server. The authentication server interrogates the client and then issues an SID to a qualified client. A valid SID typically comprises a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time, the IP address of the user computer, and a digital signature. The authentication server then forwards a new request consisting of the original URL appended by the SI to the client in a Redirect. The modified request formed by a new URL is automatically forwarded by the client browser to the content server. When the content server receives a URL request accompanied by an SID, it logs the URL with the SID and the user IP address in a transaction log and proceeds to validate the SID. When the SID is so validated, the content server sends the requested document for display by the client's web browser. (Col. 3, lines 21-49).

Levergood does not contain the elements claimed by Applicant in the present application. At the least, Levergood fails to teach or suggest "generating a transfer ticket that includes an identifier identifying the particular file on the at least one replica server if the user has been granted authorization access, *wherein the transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to the content server*," as recited in feature (d) of claims 1, 13, 25, and 39. Levergood instead discloses the authentication server issuing of a valid SID that comprises "a user identifier, an accessible domain, a key identifier, an expiration time such as date, the IP address of the user computer, and an unforgettable digital signature." (Col 3, lines 33-47). The authentication server can then forward a new request consisting of the original URL appended by the SID to the client in a Redirect. Since the SID includes the IP address of the user computer, the modified request formed by the new URL that is forwarded to the content server is bound to the client address apparent to the first server. See also Appeal Brief of 9/11/07, pp. 13-14.

The Examiner cites Levergood at column 9, lines 7-20 as describing feature (d) of claims 1, 13, 25, and 39, but this is erroneous. The Examiner alleges that Levergood therein describes an SID generated that comprises a telephone number, and that is therefore not bound to the client address. However, as shown in FIG. 6 and column 9, lines 17-20 and lines 26-32, in Levergood, the telephone number is sent from the client browser to a directory server 602 before it is transferred to the content server (merchant server 603), where it is translated to a target URL that is subsequently forwarded to the content server. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the translation of the telephone number into a target URL is apparently unrelated to the SID. Levergood in fact states that SID protection is optional to the embodiment shown in FIG. 6. See Levergood, column 9, lines 9-10. When SID protection is utilized in the embodiment shown in FIG. 6, it functions in the exact same way as is described earlier in Levergood, wherein the SID comprises the IP address of the client. See Levergood, column 10, lines 10-14 ("The Target URL contained in Message 3 can be an ordinary URL to an uncontrolled page, or it can be a URL that describes a controlled page. If the Target URL describes a controlled page then authentication is performed as previously described.").

For at least these reasons, Levergood fails to teach or suggest a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server and a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server.

A secondary reference stands or falls with the primary reference. Because Levergood fails to teach or suggest a transfer ticket that is not bound to the client address apparent to the first server and a URL ticket that is bound to the client address apparent to the second server, a combination of Levergood with FileNet, also fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, 25, and 39 are patentable over these references, and claims 3-6, 8-10, 12, 15-18, 20-22, 24, 27-30, 32-34, and 36 are allowable

because they depend upon allowable independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 are allowable over the cited references. Because the secondary references stand or fall with the primary references, claims are allowable because they are dependent upon the allowable independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and passage to issue of claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-30, 32-34, 36, and 39 as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38329
Telephone No: 650-969-7474

Date: November 18, 2008